

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 are pending in the application, with Claims 1, 4 and 7 being independent claims.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bick* (U.K. Pat. App. No. GB 2,367,530).

Please amend Claims 1, 4 and 7 as shown herein. No new matter has been added.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner states that *Bick* renders the claim obvious. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Amended Claim 1 recites, in part, a keypad assembly for a portable radiotelephone, comprising *a key button part having a plurality of key buttons being integrally formed with each other and being positioned with no spacing in between for functioning in one of a keypad mode and a touch screen panel mode; and a power supply unit supplying power to the keypad and cutting off power to the touch screen panel in the keypad mode.*

Bick discloses a keypad assembly 7 for a portable radiotelephone (Abstract; Fig. 3), comprising a key button part 17 having a plurality of key buttons 18 for functioning in one of a keypad mode and a touch screen panel mode (page 4 lines 18-19); and a power supply unit (page 4 lines 5-6).

It is respectfully asserted that *Bick* fails to teach or fairly suggest the key buttons 18 being integrally formed with each other and being positioned with no spacing in between. *Bick* teaches away from key buttons being positioned with no spacing in between by explicitly showing the key buttons 18 being formed separately and being spaced apart from each other in Figs. 1, 3, and

5. By contrast, the key buttons 156 of the present application are integrally formed with each other and are positioned with no spacing in between (Specification paragraph 0029 lines 2-4; FIGs. 1-3).

Second, no known art nor *Bick* discloses the capability of cutting off power to the touch screen panel in the keypad mode, as conceded by the Examiner in the Office Action page 4 third paragraph. The Examiner then alleged that "a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to . . . conserve power by cutting off the power supply to one of the input modes" (Office Action page 4 last paragraph). Respectfully, there is no support for the allegation, except the hindsight of the present application.

Bick fails to teach or fairly suggest at least two limitations of Amended Claim 1, i.e. *a key button part having a plurality of key buttons being integrally formed with each other and being positioned with no spacing in between for functioning in one of a keypad mode and a touch screen panel mode; and a power supply unit supplying power to the keypad and cutting off power to the touch screen panel in the keypad mode.*

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is incorrect, and withdrawal of the same is respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the above rationale for Amended Claim 1 also similarly applies to Amended Claim 4 with respect to *Bick*. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is incorrect, and withdrawal of the same is respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the above rationale for Amended Claim 1 also similarly applies to Amended Claim 7 with respect to *Bick*. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is incorrect, and withdrawal of the same is respectfully requested.

Regarding Claims 2-3, 5-6 and 8, while not conceding the patentability of the dependent claims, *per se*, it is respectfully asserted that Claims 2-3, 5-6 and 8 are also patentable for at least the above reasons. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-8 are allowable over *Bick*, and is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-8, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Douglas M. Owens III', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Douglas M. Owens III
Reg. No. 51,314
Attorney for Applicants

The Farrell Law Firm, LLP
290 Broadhollow Road, Suite 210 E
Melville, New York 11747
Tel 516-228-3565
Fax 516-228-8475

DMO/RCC/df